



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,767	03/26/2004	Shudong Wang	CCI-029CN	9076
959 7590 03/15/2007 LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE BOSTON, MA 02109-2127			EXAMINER RAO, DEEPAK R	
			ART UNIT 1624	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE 3 MONTHS			MAIL DATE 03/15/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/810,767	Applicant(s) WANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Deepak Rao	Art Unit 1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 19-22 ~~8~~ are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 19-22 ~~8~~ are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on December 21, 2006.

Claims 1-17 and 19-22 are pending in this application.

Withdrawn Rejections/Objections:

Applicant is notified that any outstanding rejection/objection that is not expressly maintained in this office action has been withdrawn or rendered moot in view of applicant's amendments and/or remarks.

The following rejections are maintained:

1. Claims 14-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of treating a proliferative disorder of the type disclosed in Table 3 (page 43 of the specification), does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of treating proliferative disorder generally. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The reasons provided in the previous office action are incorporated here by reference.

Applicant argues that 'the specification sets forth data from biochemical and biological assays indicating the efficacy of the disclosed compounds for inhibition of CDK enzyme (such as CDK2 or CDK4) and thus, it would not be undue burden to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine which proliferative disorders may be treated'. However, the data in Tables 1-3 is with the biological activity with respect to specific types of cancer and there is nothing in the

Art Unit: 1624

specification how this data for a limited number of compounds of the large genus of instant claims, tested on a single class of protein, extrapolates to all the other proliferative diseases of the instant claims. Applicant did not state on record or provide any guidance that the assays provided are correlated to the clinical efficacy of the treatment of various disorders encompassed by the claims. As can be seen from specification, the *in vitro* data holds significant role in determining the dosage regimen based on the minimal effective concentration of each of the compound to achieve the desired inhibition of the enzymes.

Further, neither the specification nor the state of the art references provide how the instant data of Example 19 can be extrapolated to the treatment of all types of proliferative diseases, including those related to CDK enzyme. For example, the development of the most efficacious strategy for the treatment of all types of cancers is based on understanding the underlying mechanisms of carcinogenesis. This includes the knowledge that the carcinogenic process is a multi-step, multi-mechanism process and that no two cancers are alike, in spite of some apparent universal characteristics, such as their inability to have growth control, to terminally differentiate, to apoptose abnormally and to have an apparent extended or immortalized life span. Since tumor promotion phase involves multiple mechanisms, there is no existence of a single therapeutic approach.

Applicant next argues that 'the instant claims are directed to methods of treating a subject for a CDK dependent proliferative disorder by administering a compound of the invention'. This is not found to be the case because claim 15 recites 'a method for the treating a subject for cancer and leukemia' and therefore, is drawn to treatment of cancer generally. It is once again submitted that existence of a single therapeutic agent for treating cancer generally is contrary to

Art Unit: 1624

our present understanding of oncology. A detailed analysis of the *Wands* factors was provided in the previous office action, which continues to be applicable to the pending claims.

Applicant's argument that 'the specification describes experimental protocols by which kinase specificity and selectivity of various compounds of the invention for the inhibition of CDK (Example 19) ' is fully considered. However, the state of the art (see Blain) is indicative that 'the specific functions of Cdk are poorly understood'. Further, Lu Valle reference provides that "To obtain a more detailed understanding of chondrocyte proliferation and differentiation, much more work in this field will be necessary. The pathways connecting the mentioned growth factors to cell cycle genes, as well as negative regulation of these genes, have to be analyzed in much more detail" (see page 12). The reference further provides that "due to the complex biology of the skeleton *in vivo*, the results obtained in such studies will have to be confirmed by experiments using transgenic or "knockout" mice to contribute more significantly to our understanding of growth plate function". This clearly illustrates the unpredictability of cell cyclin dependent kinase pathways and mechanisms and therefore, one skilled in the art would not reach the conclusion whether or not the compound will be effective in treating cancer, without going through undue experimentation.

The specification provides no evidence to show enablement for treating cancer generally. Where the utility is unusual or difficult to treat or speculative, the examiner has authority to require evidence that tests relied on are reasonably predictive of *in vivo* efficacy by those skilled in the art. See for example *In re Ruskin* 148 USPQ 221; *Ex parte Jovanovics* 211 USPQ 907. Applicant has not provided any reference(s) that forms sufficient evidence that claimed uses were art-recognized based on activity relied on at the time of applicants' effective filing date.

Art Unit: 1624

MPEP 2164.05(a).

Applicant's attention is directed to *In re Buting*, 163 USPQ 689 (CCPA 1969), wherein 'evidence involving a single compound and two types of cancer, was held insufficient to establish the utility of the claims directed to disparate types of cancers. The judges in that case indicated that: "We are not aware of any reputable authority which would accept appellant's two clinical cases as establishing utility for treatment of cancer in humans. As was pointed out in *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 USPQ 689, a process to be patentable must produce a useful result and be of substantial utility not merely of scientific interest or for further testing. In this case further testing seems necessary".

Applicant has not provided sufficient evidence that establishes that the disclosure would have enabled for one skilled in the art at the time of filing. Further, the state of the art does not identify a single class of compounds that can treat all types of proliferative diseases of the instant claims. Further, one skilled in the art of medicinal therapy recognizes that there are complex interactions between individual genetic, developmental state, sex, dietary, environmental, drug, and lifestyle factors that contribute to the carcinogenic process, making it even more challenging to have a single therapeutic agent for the treatment of diverse diseases. Rigorously planned and executed clinical trials, incorporating measurement of appropriate biomarkers and pharmacodynamic endpoints are critical for selecting the optimal dose and schedule. A detailed understanding of the molecular mode of action of the kinase inhibitors alongside the elucidation of the molecular pathology of individual cancers is required to identify tumor types and individual patients that may benefit most from treatment. It is also important to construct a pharmacologic audit trail linking molecular biomarkers and pharmacokinetic and

Art Unit: 1624

pharmacodynamic parameters to receptor response endpoints. Therefore, it is maintained that applicants have not provided sufficient test assays or data to support the method of treatment commensurate in scope with the claims, as of the filing date of the application.

2. Claims 1-17 and 19-22 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,531,479, for the reasons provided in the previous office action.

It is acknowledged that applicant 'will consider submitting a terminal disclaimer if appropriate'.

The following rejections are necessitated by the amendment:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "[4-(2-amino-4-methyl-thiazol-5-yl)-pyrimidin-2-yl]-(3-bromo-phenyl)-amine [16]" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in claim 2 on which claim 4 is dependent.

Duplicate claims

Claims 6, 8 and 9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 1, 3 and 4 respectively (i.e., claim 6 is identical to claim 1; claim 8 is identical to claim 3; and claim 9 is identical to claim 4). When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1624

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deepak Rao whose telephone number is (571) 272-0672. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson, can be reached at (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Deepak Rao
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624

March 12, 2007